



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,886	03/30/2004	Jay Scott TUCKER	000100-203	2885
29306	7590	11/30/2004		EXAMINER
MARSTELLER & ASSOCIATES, P. C. P. O. BOX 803302 DALLAS, TX 75380-3302				ROY, SIKHA
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/708,886	TUCKER, JAY SCOTT
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sikha Roy	2879	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-6 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4-6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0304.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claim 1-3 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Group I, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on November 15, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,760,307 to Howorth.

Regarding claim 4 Howorth discloses (Figs. 3A-3C column 4 lines 34-64, column 6 lines 29-61) faceplate for an image intensifier tube with anti-veiling glare window having opposing upper and lower surfaces, comprising a blank of glass with desired glass composition having shape conforming to the configuration of the faceplate, the metal oxide in the glass being reduced in an atmosphere of hydrogen and thus forming dark layer appearance (blackened) and absorbing radiation. Howorth discloses the entire surface of the window is subjected to reducing atmosphere creating radiation-absorbent color center layer over the whole surface and then the layer is selectively removed from the inner and other major faces to obtain the window. Howorth discloses

in Fig. 3C the processed upper surface 30 of the glass blank having a blackened ring about the light transmissive area and the bottom surface having desired aperture for passing light.

Regarding claims 5 and 6 Howorth discloses in Fig. 3C the upper and lower surfaces 30, 31 of the window are essentially parallel and flat.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,023,511 to Phillips, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,078,773 to Thomas.

Regarding claim 4 Phillips discloses (Figs. 1, 2, column 2 lines 35-60) an image intensifier tube 22 having a faceplate 28 comprising blank optical material of desired glass having shape conforming substantially to the configuration of the face plate with opposing upper and bottom surfaces.

Phillips does not disclose the blank being blackened and processed and upper surface having blackened ring about the light transmissive portion and the bottom surface having substantially all blackening removed with desired aperture.

Thomas in same field of endeavor discloses (Figs. 3, 4a-4d column 3 lines 61-through column 4 line 2, column 4 lines 18-50, column 5 lines 19-28) optical glass blank 40 is blackened by reducing in an atmosphere of hydrogen and then blank is processed to form the light receiving and transmitting surfaces. Thomas discloses the upper surface is processed having blackened ring about the light transmissive portion and the bottom surface is processed creating aperture for passing light. Thomas further discloses this blackened area surrounding the upper surface absorbs substantially all the stray light caused by reflection from the glass surface and thus reduces veiling glare.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply blackening and processing of the glass blank so that the upper surface has blackened ring about the light transmissive portion and the bottom surface has aperture for passing light as taught by Thomas to the faceplate of the image intensifier tube of Phillips for absorbing substantially all the stray light caused by reflection from the glass surface and thus reducing veiling glare.

Regarding claims 5 and 6 Phillips discloses the upper and lower surfaces of the faceplate substantially parallel and flat.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 4,414,009 to Siegmund discloses image intensifier faceplate with reduced veiling glare.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 308-7382.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Roy
Sikha Roy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879


Nimeshkumar D. Patel
VIP PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER